

## **REMARKS**

### **Status of the Claims**

Claims 7 and 10-13 are now present in this application. Claims 7, 10 and 12 are independent.

Claims 1-6, 8 and 9 have been canceled and claims 7, 10, 12 and 13 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

The Examiner states that claims 8 and 10-12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 7 has been amended to include claim 8. Claims 10 and 12 have been rewritten in independent form. As such it is respectfully submitted that claims 7, 10 and 12 are allowable.

### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph**

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 13 is rejected because it depends from non-elected claim 1. Claim 13 has been amended to depend from any one of amended claims 7, 10 and 12. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 7 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art described by applicants on page 1 of the specification in view of any one of U.S. Patent Nos. 3,188,784 (Nordolf), 4,274,843 (Sone, et al.) or 4,376,637 (Yang). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, claim 7 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 8 as indicated by the Examiner. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 7 is allowable.

As claim 13 depends from claim 7, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13 is also patentable for at least its dependency. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

### **Conclusion**

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Dennis Powei Chen, Registration No. at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: March 9, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By 

D. Richard Anderson

Registration No.: 40439

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

703-205-8000